



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/551,518	06/05/2006	Rupert Katritzky	7675P001	6077
8791 7590 12/29/2009 BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP 1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040				
EXAMINER				
MCLELLAND, KIMBERLY KEIL				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1791				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/29/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/551,518

Applicant(s)

KATRITZKY ET AL.

Examiner

KIMBERLY K. MCCLELLAND

Art Unit

1791

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 August 2009.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 74-128 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 82-128 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 74-81 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 September 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 08/12/09
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. This application contains claims 82-128 drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in the reply filed on 02/06/09. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

Response to Amendment

Applicant is reminded they need to explicitly point out where support for all the newly claimed features comes from as required by MPEP 714.02 and 2163.06. See 37 CFR 1.111.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the orientation mechanism, the input, and the remote processor must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure

is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1 and 74-81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Independent claim 1 requires a label applicator is adapted to alter the way in which the label is applied depending upon the dimensions of the pack to be labeled. The specification does not adequately describe an applicator which alters "the way" a label is applied. On the contrary, the specification appears to disclose an applicator

which applies labels in the same manner on different sized packs (See Figures 5-6).

The breadth of the claims is sufficiently broad such that it is unclear how the required function would be performed. The nature of the invention does not appear to indicate a change in "the way" a label is applied. The inventor has not provided any direction as to how one alters the way a label is applied. No working examples have been provided which demonstrate various ways of applying labels. Clarification is required. Claims 74-81 are rejected due to dependency on independent claim 1.

5. Claim 76 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The term "orientation mechanism" does not appear in the current specification. The drawings do not illustrate this feature.

Clarification is required.

6. Claim 77 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The term "input" does not appear in the current specification. The drawings do not illustrate this feature. Clarification is required.

7. Claim 79 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which

was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The term "remote processor" does not appear in the current specification. The drawings do not illustrate this feature. Clarification is required.

8. Claim 80 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The term "remote processor" does not appear in the current specification. The drawings do not illustrate this feature. Clarification is required.

9. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

10. Claims 1 and 74-81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Independent claim 1 requires the label applicator is "adapted to alter the way in which the label is applied depending upon the dimensions of the pack to be labeled". It is unclear what structural adaptation is being claimed. How is the label applicator adapted? It is unclear how a labeler alters "the way" a label is applied. On the contrary, the specification appears to disclose an

applicator which applies labels in the same manner on different sized packs (See Figures 5-6). While it appears some variation in orientation may be employed (Figure 7), such an alteration does not constitute a change in “the way” the label is applied or the structure of the apparatus. Furthermore, the packs are not positively recited as features of the currently claimed apparatus. It is unclear how the apparatus structure may be dependent upon its contents. It is unclear from the specification as filed what structure performs this function. Applicant has not specified what structure of the currently claimed apparatus performs this function. Clarification is required. Claims 74-81 are rejected due to dependency on independent claim 1.

11. What structure performs the functional language of “adapted to alter the way in which the label is applied depending upon the dimensions of the pack to be labeled”?
12. What features are being claimed with a recitation of a label applicator “adapted to alter the way in which the label is applied depending upon the dimensions of the pack to be labeled”?
13. As to claim 77, it is unclear what is meant by “an input”. What structure is being claimed?
14. As to claims 79-80, it is unclear how an apparatus may include a “remote” processor. Is the processor apart of the system or not? How may a portion of the system be remote from the system? What is the processor remote from?

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

15. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

16. Claims 1 and 74-81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,317,648 to Sleep et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,036,812 to Williams et al.

17. With respect to claim 1, Sleep et al. discloses a labeling apparatus, including a feeder (26) a pharmaceutical pack, said means being arranged to deliver said pack to a labeling station (32/38/34), wherein said labeling station comprises a label printer (34) arranged to print a label comprising information specific to a patient for whom said pharmaceutical pack is intended, a label applicator (i.e. combined labelers; 38; column 10, lines 27-35) to said pack, wherein the label applicator is adapted to alter the way in which the label is applied depending upon the dimensions of the pack to be labeled (column 10, lines 27-35); the system further comprising a delivery subsystem (i.e. output; column 10, lines 7-9) to deliver said pack from the labeling station so as to be accessible to a user. Sleep et al. does not specifically disclose the feeder is a robot arm.

18. Williams et al. discloses a pill dispensing system, including the use of a robot arm as a feeder (column 3, lines 60-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the robot arm of Williams et al.

with the feeder of Sleep et al. The motivation would have been to allow selective feeding of individual containers (column 3, lines 60-65).

19. Expressions relating the apparatus to contents thereof during an intended operation are of no significance in determining patentability of the apparatus claim. Ex parte Thibault, 164 USPQ 666, 667 (Bd. App. 1969). Consequently, the pharmaceutical packs and labels are not structurally limiting to the currently claimed apparatus.

20. The examiner would like to note that while features of an apparatus may be recited either structurally or functionally, claims directed to an apparatus must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function. In re Schreiber, 128 F.3d 1473, 1477-78, 44 USPQ2d 1429, 1431-32 (Fed. Cir. 1997); "[A]pparatus claims cover what a device is, not what a device does." Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Bausch & Lomb Inc., 909 F.2d 1464, 1469, 15 USPQ2d 1525, 1528 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (emphasis in original). A claim containing a "recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus" if the prior art apparatus teaches all the structural limitations of the claim. Ex parte Masham, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1987). Examiner notes the phrases "comprising information specific to a patient for whom said pharmaceutical pack is intended" and "so as to be accessible to a user" are drawn to the intended use of the currently claimed apparatus and do not further structurally define the apparatus. See MPEP § 2114.

21. As to claim 74, Sleep et al. discloses the apparatus is arranged such that the labeling station (38) applies the label in an orientation (column 10, lines 27-35) relative

to the pack. The phrase, "which is dependent upon at least one dimension of the pack" is drawn to the contents of the apparatus and does not structurally contribute to the currently claimed apparatus.

22. As to claim 75, Sleep et al. discloses the labeling station is arranged to orient the pack and label applicator (38) relative to one another (column 10, lines 27-35).

23. As to claim 76, Sleep et al. discloses an orientation mechanism to adjust the label applicator's orientation (32).

24. As to claim 77, Sleep et al. discloses the labeling station further comprises an input (36; column 7, lines 6-9) to receive an instruction as to how the label is to be applied (column 10, lines 27-35).

25. As to claim 78, Sleep et al. discloses the label applicator is arranged to apply the label at a predetermined position on the pack (column 10, lines 27-35). The phrase "the position being variable from one pack type to another" is drawn to the contents of the apparatus and does not structurally contribute to the currently claimed apparatus.

26. As to claim 79, Sleep et al. discloses the apparatus includes a remote processor (14) to pass information to the labeling station to enable the label applicator to apply the label in the predetermined position (column 10, lines 27-35).

27. As to claim 80, Sleep et al. discloses the apparatus includes a remote processor (14) to pass label positioning information directly to the labeling station or label applicator (column 10, lines 27-354).

28. As to claim 81, Sleep et al. discloses the apparatus includes labels of common size to all packs (column 10, lines 27-35).

29. Claims 1 and 74-81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,672,356 to Jenkins et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,036,812 to Williams et al.

30. With respect to claim 1, Jenkins et al. discloses a labeling system, including a feeder (10/12/20/28/30), said feeder being arranged to deliver said pack to a labeling station (38), wherein said labeling station comprises a label printer (122) arranged to print a label comprising information specific to a patient for whom said pack is intended, a label applicator (138) to apply said label to said pack, wherein the means for applying the label is adapted to alter the way in which the label is applied depending upon the dimensions of the pack to be labeled (column 9, lines 44-47); the system further comprising a delivery subsystem (20/28) to deliver said pack from the labeling station so as to be accessible to a user (column 5, lines 2-17). Jenkins et al. does not specifically disclose the feeder is a robot arm.

31. Williams et al. discloses a pill dispensing system, including the use of a robot arm as a feeder (column 3, lines 60-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the robot arm of Williams et al. with the feeder of Jenkins et al. The motivation would have been to allow selective feeding of individual containers (column 3, lines 60-65).

32. Expressions relating the apparatus to contents thereof during an intended operation are of no significance in determining patentability of the apparatus claim. Ex

parte Thibault, 164 USPQ 666, 667 (Bd. App. 1969). Consequently, the pharmaceutical packs and labels are not structurally limiting to the currently claimed apparatus.

33. The examiner would like to note that while features of an apparatus may be recited either structurally or functionally, claims directed to an apparatus must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function. In re Schreiber, 128 F.3d 1473, 1477-78, 44 USPQ2d 1429, 1431-32 (Fed. Cir. 1997); “[A]pparatus claims cover what a device is, not what a device does.” Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Bausch & Lomb Inc., 909 F.2d 1464, 1469, 15 USPQ2d 1525, 1528 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (emphasis in original). A claim containing a “recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus” if the prior art apparatus teaches all the structural limitations of the claim. Ex parte Masham, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1987). Examiner notes the phrases “comprising information specific to a patient for whom said pharmaceutical pack is intended” and “so as to be accessible to a user” are drawn to the intended use of the currently claimed apparatus and do not further structurally define the apparatus. See MPEP § 2114.

34. As to claim 74, Jenkins et al. discloses the apparatus is arranged such that the labeling station (38) applies the label in an orientation (column 5, lines 2-17; column 9, lines 44-47) relative to the pack. The phrase, “which is dependent upon at least one dimension of the pack” is drawn to the contents of the apparatus and does not structurally contribute to the currently claimed apparatus.

35. As to claim 75, Jenkins et al. discloses the labeling station is arranged to orient the pack and label applicator (138) relative to one another (column 5, lines 2-17; column 9, lines 44-47).
36. As to claim 76, Jenkins et al. discloses the label applicator (138) further comprises an orientation mechanism (84) to adjust the label applicator's orientation (column 9, lines 44-47).
37. As to claim 77, Jenkins et al. discloses the labeling station further comprises an input (32) to receive an instruction as to how the label is to be applied (column 9, lines 44-54).
38. As to claim 78, Jenkins et al. discloses the label applicator is arranged to apply the label at a predetermined position on the pack (column 5, lines 2-17; column 9, lines 44-47). The phrase "the position being variable from one pack type to another" is drawn to the contents of the apparatus and does not structurally contribute to the currently claimed apparatus.
39. As to claim 79, Jenkins et al. discloses the apparatus further comprising a remote processor (44) to pass information to the labeling station to enable the label applicator to apply the label in the predetermined position (column 9, lines 44-54).
40. As to claim 80, Jenkins et al. discloses the apparatus further comprising a remote processor (44) to pass label positioning information directly to the labeling station or label applicator (column 9, lines 44-54).
41. As to claim 81, Jenkins et al. discloses the apparatus includes labels of common size for application to all packs (See Figures 2 and 2A).

Response to Arguments

42. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 75-81 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant's remaining pertinent arguments are addressed below:

43. Applicant is reminded they need to explicitly point out where support for all the newly claimed features comes from as required by MPEP 714.02 and 2163.06. See 37 CFR 1.111.

44. With respect to applicant's argument that the claim language "the way" equates to label orientation, this argument is not persuasive. Examiner notes the term "way" equates to the manner in which a label is applied **by the applicator**, not its orientation. Applicant argues the specification discloses several examples of altering the orientation of a label, without identifying any alteration in the manner in which the label applicator operates. Alteration of the orientation of the label does not equate to an alteration in the way in which label applicator is structured in the apparatus. Furthermore, the currently claimed system is drawn to an apparatus, not a method. Applicant has not positively recited either the labels or the packs in the current claims. Therefore, orientation of either the labels or the packs does not affect patentability of the currently claimed apparatus or alter the structure of the apparatus. Applicant has not shown enablement exists for any alteration in the manner in which the label applicator functions during label application. Consequently, the rejection is maintained.

45. As to applicant's arguments that the phrase "depending on the dimensions of the pack to be labeled" imparts patentability to the claims, examiner disagrees.

Expressions relating the apparatus to contents thereof during an intended operation are of no significance in determining patentability of the apparatus claim. Ex parte Thibault, 164 USPQ 666, 667 (Bd. App. 1969). Consequently, the pharmaceutical packs and labels are not structurally limiting to the currently claimed apparatus. Furthermore, labelers are inherently structured to apply labels to packs with dimensions. If packs of the same dimension are used in the applicator, no alteration in the manner in which labels are applied would be necessary.

46. With respect to applicant's argument that "the recited structure of independent claim is dependent upon the packs and labels to be able of using a single labeler to apply labels to packs of varying dimensions", this argument is not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., packs, packs of varying dimensions, labels, a single labeler) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

47. The examiner would like to note that while features of an apparatus may be recited either structurally or functionally, claims directed to an apparatus must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function. In *re Schreiber*, 128 F.3d 1473, 1477-78, 44 USPQ2d 1429, 1431-32 (Fed. Cir. 1997);

"[A]pparatus claims cover what a device is, not what a device does." *Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Bausch & Lomb Inc.*, 909 F.2d 1464, 1469, 15 USPQ2d 1525, 1528 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (emphasis in original). A claim containing a "recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus" if the prior art apparatus teaches all the structural limitations of the claim. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1987). See MPEP § 2114.

48. In response to applicant's argument that Jenkins does not disclose an automated pharmaceutical dispensing system, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

49. As to applicant's arguments that neither Sleep nor Jenkins disclose an applicator "adapted to alter the way in which the label is applied depending upon the dimensions of the pack to be labeled". This argument is not persuasive. The claim language is unclear. The claim language is not enabled. The packs are not positively recited as components of the currently claimed system. Therefore, the structure of the apparatus cannot be dependent upon the dimensions of the packs. The presence or absence of packs is irrelevant to the patentability of the current apparatus claims. The structures of both Sleep and Jenkins are capable of operating in such a manner where the label applicator "is adapted to alter the way in which the label is applied depending upon the dimensions of the pack to be labeled", because such an adaptation does not require

any further structural features. It is well settled that the intended use of a claimed apparatus is not germane to the issue of the patentability of the claimed structure. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the claimed use then it meets the claim. *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235, 238 (CCPA 1967); *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 459 (CCPA 1963). Consequently, the limitation of a label applicator "adapted to alter the way in which the label is applied depending upon the dimensions of the pack to be labeled" cannot distinguish over the prior art.

Conclusion

50. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KIMBERLY K. MCCLELLAND whose telephone number is (571)272-2372. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 a.m.-5 p.m. Mon-Thr.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Philip C. Tucker can be reached on (571)272-1095. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kimberly K McClelland/
Examiner, Art Unit 1791

KKM

/Philip C Tucker/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1791